

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-4 and 6-7 will remain pending and under examination. No new matter is being presented, and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (J.P. 2002-101059) in view of Ando et al. (U.S. 2002-271860). The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The following is a comparison between embodiments of the present invention and the cited art.

According to independent claim 1, the portable telephone main body comprises a first interface unit connected to the audio signal processing unit and the video signal processing unit for connecting thereto the broadcast receiver unit. The broadcast receiver unit comprises a second interface unit connected to the first interface unit of the portable telephone main body, and a signal feeding unit for feeding an audio signal and a video signal included in a received television broadcast signal to the second interface unit, and the audio signal processing unit of the portable telephone main body applies a signal processing to the audio signal fed thereto from the broadcast receiver unit via the first interface unit for output to the speaker, while the video signal processing unit applies a signal processing to the video signal fed thereto from the broadcast receiver unit via the first interface unit for output to the display with the broadcast receiver unit attached to the portable telephone main body.

The Examiner states, on page 4 of the Action, as follows: Suzuki et al. does not explicitly teach “a signal feeding unit for feeding an audio signal and a video signal included in a received television broadcast signal to the second interface unit” as a structure of the data-broadcasting receiving unit. (Emphasis in original.) However, the Examiner cites Ando et al. as disclosing these features, and states: Ando et al. teaches “a signal feeding unit for feeding an audio signal and a video signal included in a received television broadcast signal to the second interface

unit (Drawings 1; TV connection connector 30 (which seems to be a misprint of referential numeral 19))” as a structure of a television receiver’s side. (Emphasis in original.)

However, in Ando et al., a “TV connector 19” which is a part of the television receiver’s side feeds image data obtained from an external connector 35 of a television receiver 30 to an image comparison section 17 of a mobile phone terminal 10. (See, paragraph [0021] and Fig. 1 in Ando et al.). Therefore, the image data obtained from the external connector 35 is not outputted to a display. In addition, audio data is not obtained from the external connector 35 of the television receiver 30.

In contrast, according to embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, an audio signal and a video signal included in a television broadcast signal received by the broadcast receiver unit are fed from the first interface unit of the portable phone main body to the audio signed processing means and the video signal processing means, respectively. Then, they are outputted to the speaker and the display.

Consequently, the Examiner’s recognition that Ando et al. teaches “a signal feeding unit for feeding an audio signal and a video signal included in a received television broadcast signal to the second interface unit (Drawings 1; TV connection connector 30)” is not correct. It appears, therefore, that the Examiner may have misunderstood various portions of the cited reference Ando et al.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references, alone or in combination. Further, dependent claims 2, 4 and 6-7 inherit the patentability of independent claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 3 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Ando, and further in view of Kawata et al. (U.S. 2003/0181226). Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1 and patentably distinguishes over Suzuki and Ando for at least the reasons presented above. It is further submitted that Kawata et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki and Ando, and is not cited as doing such.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 278542009300. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 14, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael Stanley/
Michael Stanley

Registration No.: 58,523
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
(858) 314-7795